	ga - tauri,
·	FILED ES DISTRICT COURT IN CLERKS OFFICE MASSACHUSERTS
RECE	1005 JAN 26 P 2: 1!
orio, eec,	MONS 198UED AVO MONS 198UED AVO J.S. DISTRICT COURT AL RULE 4.1 VER FORM DISTRICT OF MASS.
Plaintiff, WA	DPTY OLK CAS
v.	CIVIL ACTION NO.
SYDNEY, INC., d/b/a OAD MIDWEST, WALSTROM GROUP, INC., GARY W. WALSTROM, and CECELIA BRUENING,	05cv10150 RC
Defendants.)	MAGISTRATE JUDGE / Magistrale
	- Jane

NOTICE OF REMOVAL

TO: CLERK OF COURT U.S. DISTRICT COURT for the DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that defendants Sydney, Inc., d/b/a OAD Midwest, Walstrom Group, Inc., Gary W. Walstrom, and Cecelia Bruening (the "Defendants") hereby file this Notice of Removal, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b), and respectfully state that the grounds for removal are as follows:

1. On or about November 15, 2004, Plaintiff commenced a civil action entitled OAD, LLC v. Sydney, Inc., d/b/a OAD Midwest, Walstrom Group, Inc., Gary W. Walstrom, Cecelia Breuning (sic)¹, Civil Action No. 04-1381B (the "Action"), in Massachusetts Superior Court, Plymouth County. Service of the Complaint, Summons and Civil Action sheet was made in accordance with the Massachusetts Rules of Civil Procedure on January 5, 2005. True and accurate copies of the Complaint, Summons, Civil Action Cover Sheet, Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction, Affidavit of Michael Gray, Memorandum in Support of Plaintiff's

¹ In Plaintiffs' original Complaint, Defendant Cecelia Bruening's surname is incorrectly spelled as "Breuning." Defendants refer the Court to her name's proper spelling.

Motion for Preliminary Injunction and Order of Notice are attached hereto as Exhibit A.

- 2. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff OAD, LLC is a Massachusetts corporation with a principal place of business at 168 High Street, Norwell, Massachusetts.
- 3. Defendant Sydney, Inc., d/b/a OAD Midwest ("Sydney") is a Nebraska corporation organized under the laws of the state of Nebraska, with a principal place of business at 1241 West 67th Street, Kansas City, Missouri.
- 4. Defendant Walstrom Group, Inc. ("Walstrom Group") is a Missouri corporation organized under the laws of the state of Missouri, with a principal place of business at 1241 West 67th Street, Kansas City, Missouri.
- 5. Defendant Gary W. Walstrom ("Walstrom") is an individual who resides in Kansas City, Missouri.
- 6. Defendant Cecelia Bruening ("Bruening") is an individual who resides in Kansas City, Missouri.
- 7. In its Complaint, Plaintiffs allege that Defendants 1) breached contracts for the distribution and promotion of OAD's personnel and organizational survey and training management materials, and 2) violated non-solicitation provisions of those contracts. Plaintiffs also allege that Defendant Walstrom breached a fiduciary duty to OAD, and defamed OAD to OAD's clients. Plaintiffs seek injunctive relief, damages for the complained-of conduct, interests, costs, and attorneys' fees.
- 8. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332 because the parties are of diverse citizenship and, based on a reasonable reading of the Complaint, the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs.
- 9. This Notice of Removal is being filed within thirty (30) days of Defendants' receipt of the Complaint and Summons, as required by 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b).

- 10. Defendants have, on this January 26, 2005 sent copies of this Notice of Removal to Plaintiff's counsel and to the Clerk of the Massachusetts Superior Court, Plymouth County, to be filed with that Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d).
- 11. By filing this Notice of Removal, the appearing Defendants do not waive any defenses or rights that may be available to them.

Pursuant to Local Rule 81.1 of this Court, within thirty (30) days Defendants will file with the Clerk of the Court certified or attested copies of all records and proceedings in the State Court and a certified or attested copy of all docket entries there.

WHEREFORE, Defendants hereby remove the Action from the Superior Court Department of the Trial Court for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Plymouth County, to the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, and respectfully requests that this Court take jurisdiction of this civil action to the exclusion of any further proceedings in the Massachusetts state courts.

Respectfully submitted,

SYDNEY, INC., d/b/a OAD MIDWEST. WALSTROM GROUP, INC., GARY W. WALSTROM, and CECELIA BRUENING

By their attorneys

January 26, 2005

Íra K. Gross (Board of Bar Overseers

Number 212720)

Nicholas M. O'Donnell (Board of Bar Overseers

Number 657950)

SULLIVAN & WORCESTER LLP

One Post Office Square

Boston, MA 02109

(617) 338-2800

I hereby certify that a copy of the above document was served on counsel of record for all parties

by hand/neathon 46 65.

.

Case 1:05-cv-10150-RCL Document 1 Filed 01/26/2005 Page 5 of 20 PLYMOUTH, ss. SUPERIOR COURT DEPARTMENT OF THE TRIAL COURT OF THE COMMONWEALTH CIVIL ACTION NO. OLL 1381
OAD LLC Plaintiff(s)
vs. Sydney, Inc., d/b/a OAD Midwest, Walstrom Group, Inc., Gary W. Walstrom, Cecelia Breuning, Defendant(s)
<u>SUMMONS</u>
To the above-named defendant: Gary W. Walstrom
You are hereby summoned and required to serve upon Martin P. Desmery, Esq plaintiff attorney, whose address is Craig and Macauley P.C., 600 Atlantic Avenue, an answer to the complaint which is herewith served upon you, within 20 days after service of this summons upon you, exclusive of the day of service. If you fail to do so, judgment by default will be taken against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You are also required to file your answer to the complaint in the office of the Clerk of this court at Plymouth either before service upon plaintiff attorney or within a reasonable time thereafter.
Unless otherwise provided by Rule 13(a), your answer must state as a counterclaim any claim which you may have against the plaintiff OAD LLC which arises out of the transaction or occurrence that is the subject matter of the plaintiff claim or you will thereafter be barred from making such claim in any other action. Witness, Barbara J. Rouse Esquire, at Plymouth the
NOTES CLERK R. Frw. us
 This summons is issued pursuant to Rule 4 of the Massachusetts Rules of Civil Procedure. When more than one defendant is involved, the names of all defendants should appear in the caption. defendant.
3. To the plaintiff's attorney: please circle type of action involved-Tort-Motor Vehicle Tort-Contract-
I hereby certify and return that on
Dated: , 2004
END TO PROCESS SEDIMED.
PLEASE PLACE DATE YOU MAKE SERVICE ON DEFENDANT IN THIS BOX ON THE ORIGINAL AND ON COPY SERVED ON DEFENDANT.

2004

PLAINTIETING	ent 1 Filed 01/26/2005 Superior	Court Department
PLAINTIFF(S)	County:_j	LYMOUTH CALL
OAD LLC	DEFENDANT(S) Sydney, Inc., d/b/a Of	
	oyuney, Inc., d/b/a Of	AD Midwest
Martin P. Desmery, Esq., Craig & Macauley,	ATTORNEY	A November (All and All and Al
600 Atlantic Ave., Boston, MA 02210	ATTORNEY (if known)	NOV 1 5 2004
(617) 367-9500 Board of Bar Overseers number: 550133		100 1 3 2004
Board of Bar Overseers number: 550133		G PATH SUPERIOR COU
Origin code and	track designation	
Eman arr X III Que DOX OFIIV:		
1. F01 Original Complaint	4. FU4 District Court Ap	peal c.231, s. 97 &104 (After
2. F02 Removal to Sup.Ct. C.231,s.104	- 31EI (X)	
(Before trial) (F)	5. F05 Reactivated after	r rescript; relief from
3. F03 Retransfer to Sup.Ct. C.231,s.102C (X)	Judgmeni/Order (Mas	S FL Civ P sov /vv
	6. E10 Summary Proces	ss Appeal (X)
TYPE OF ACTION AND TRACK DECOME NO. TYPE OF ACTION (specify) TRACK	ESIGNATION (See reverse sic	le)
(-manny) (MAON	IS THIS A JURY CASE?	,
A01 Breach of Contract (F)		
De following is a full them:	(X)Yes ()No	
he following is a full, itemized and detailed statement noney damages. For this form, disregard double or to	it of the facts on which pla	intiff relies to determine
		ate single damages only
		and a second sec
Documented medical expenses to date:	ets as necessary)	
Total hospital expenses Total Doctor expenses Total chiragenesis		
O. IOIGI CHILODISCIIC AYDADOO		. ©
TOTAL PHYSICAL INGRADY SYNGROUS		, , , , , , C
5. Total other expenses (describe)		
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Documented property damages to date		
PRODUCTION ACTIONS TO A STATE OF THE PRODUCTION		fr.
Reasonably anticipated future medical and hospital expenses Reasonably anticipated lost wages Other documented items of descriptions		\$
Reasonably anticipated lost wages Other documented items of damages (describe)		\$
Brief description of plaintiff's injury, including nature and exter	at of injury (descrite)	\$
2 Grid Ovie	it of injury (describe)	
	•	
		\$
		\$ TOTAL \$
CONTRACT	DLAIMS	TOTAL S
CONTRACT	CLAIMS Its as necessary)	TOTAL S
CONTRACT ((Attach additional sheel) (ide a detailed description of claim(s):	ets as necessary)	
CONTRACT ((Attach additional sheel) (ide a detailed description of claim(s):	ets as necessary)	
CONTRACT ((Attach additional sheel) (ide a detailed description of claim(s):	ets as necessary)	
CONTRACT	ets as necessary)	
CONTRACT ((Attach additional sheet) vide a detailed description of claim(s): Plaintiff seeks to recover damages and declain breach of contract.	ets as necessary) aratory judgment in conne	ection with Defendant
CONTRACT ((Attach additional sheet) (ide a detailed description of claim(s): Plaintiff seeks to recover damages and declain breach of contract.	ets as necessary) aratory judgment in conne	ection with Defendant
CONTRACT ((Attach additional sheet)	ets as necessary) aratory judgment in conne	ection with Defendant
CONTRACT ((Attach additional sheet) vide a detailed description of claim(s): Plaintiff seeks to recover damages and declation of contract. EASE IDENTIFY, BY CASE NUMBER, NAME AND COUNTY, ADURT DEPARTMENT	ets as necessary) Tratory judgment in conne	TOTAL S. \$50,000
CONTRACT ((Attach additional sheet) vide a detailed description of claim(s): Plaintiff seeks to recover damages and declation of contract. EASE IDENTIFY, BY CASE NUMBER, NAME AND COUNTY, ADURT DEPARTMENT	ets as necessary) Tratory judgment in conne	TOTAL S \$50,000
CONTRACT (Attach additional sheet vide a detailed description of claim(s): Plaintiff seeks to recover damages and declabreach of contract. EASE IDENTIFY, BY CASE NUMBER, NAME AND COUNTY, A DURT DEPARTMENT Dereby certify that I have complied with the requirements of spute Resolution (S.I.C. Duty 14.42).	aratory judgment in connection of the Supreme Judicio	TOTAL S \$50,000
CONTRACT (Attach additional sheet vide a detailed description of claim(s): Plaintiff seeks to recover damages and declabreach of contract. EASE IDENTIFY, BY CASE NUMBER, NAME AND COUNTY, A DURT DEPARTMENT Dereby certify that I have complied with the requirements of spute Resolution (S.I.C. Duty 14.42).	aratory judgment in connection of the Supreme Judicio	TOTAL S \$50,000
CONTRACT (Attach additional sheet vide a detailed description of claim(s): Plaintiff seeks to recover damages and declar breach of contract. EASE IDENTIFY, BY CASE NUMBER, NAME AND COUNTY, A DURT DEPARTMENT Dereby certify that I have complied with the requirements of spute Resolution (SJC Rule 1:18) requiring that I provide my plution services and discuss with them the advantages and	aratory judgment in connection of the Supreme Judicio	TOTAL S \$50,000
CONTRACT (Attach additional sheet vide a detailed description of claim(s): Plaintiff seeks to recover damages and declar breach of contract. EASE IDENTIFY, BY CASE NUMBER, NAME AND COUNTY, A DURT DEPARTMENT Dereby certify that I have complied with the requirements of spute Resolution (SJC Rule 1:18) requiring that I provide my plution services and discuss with them the advantages and	aratory judgment in connection of the Supreme Judicio	TOTAL S \$50,000
CONTRACT (Attach additional sheet vide a detailed description of claim(s): Plaintiff seeks to recover damages and declabreach of contract. EASE IDENTIFY, BY CASE NUMBER, NAME AND COUNTY, A DURT DEPARTMENT Dereby certify that I have complied with the requirements of spute Resolution (S.I.C. Duty 14.42).	aratory judgment in connection of the Supreme Judicio	TOTAL S \$50,000

RECEIVED

DEC 2 1 2004

PLYMOUTH SUPERIOR COURT

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

PLYMOUTH, ss.

SUPERIOR COURT C.A. No. 04-1381B

OAD LLC,

Plaintiff,

ν.

SYDNEY, INC., d/b/a
OAD MIDWEST, WALSTROM GROUP,
INC., GARY W. WALSTROM,
CECELIA BREUNING,

Defendants.

@COPY

AMENDED COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff OAD LLC ("OAD") commences this action against the above-captioned defendants for declaratory relief, injunctive relief, and an accounting. OAD also seeks to recover damages arising from certain breaches of fiduciary duties and breaches of contract.

PARTIES

- 1. OAD is a Massachusetts limited liability company with a principal place of business located at 168 High Street, Norwell, Massachusetts.
- 2. Sydney, Inc., d/b/a OAD Midwest ("Sydney"), is a Missouri corporation with a principal place of business located at 1241 W. 67th Street, Kansas City, Missouri.

- 3. The Walstrom Group, Inc. ("Walstrom Group") is a Missouri corporation with a principal place of business located in Kansas City, Missouri.
- 4. Gary Walstrom ("Walstrom") is an individual who resides in Kansas City, Missouri.
- 5. Cecelia Bruening ("Bruening") is an individual who resides in Kansas City, Missouri.
- 6. On information and believe, Walstrom and Bruening are married; and they are the direct or indirect owners of both Sydney and Walstrom Group. In addition, Walstrom is a member and manager of OAD.

JURISDICTION

7. This Court has jurisdiction over each of the defendants pursuant to Mass. Gen. L. ch. 223A, § 3 because they transacted business or caused tortuous injury in the Commonwealth. Moreover, this suit specifically relates to the parties' rights and obligations under certain written contracts, which expressly vest exclusive jurisdiction in the courts of Massachusetts.

STATEMENT OF UNDERLYING FACTS

8. On or about July 10, 2002, Walstrom and a
Massachusetts resident named Michael Gray ("Gray") formed
OAD as a Massachusetts company. OAD is in the business of
conducting personnel and organizational surveys and

training management in the interpretation and application of such surveys.

- 9. Gray holds the copyright on the intellectual property used by OAD; namely, the survey, research, data, scoresheets, seminar notebooks, and other materials used in connection with the business.
- 10. Gray agreed to license his intellectual property to OAD and manage the overall affairs of the business from his office in Massachusetts. Walstrom in turn agreed to act as a "Master Distributor," who would actively recruit and develop new distributors for OAD throughout most of the continental United States. Walstrom also agreed to be OAD's distributor in Missouri
- 11. On or about July 12, 2002, OAD and Walstrom entered into a Master Distributor Agreement, which Walstrom chose to execute as a duly authorized officer of Walstrom Group. On information and belief, Walstrom Group is owned or controlled entirely by Walstrom.
- 12. On or about July 18, 2002, OAD and Walstrom entered into a Distributor Agreement, which Walstrom's wife, Cecelia Bruening, executed as a duly authorized officer of Sydney. On information and belief, Sydney is owned or controlled entirely by Walstrom.

- 13. Walstrom effectively abandoned his role as Master Distributor in or around December of 2003. In March of 2004, Walstrom declared that he no longer intended to assist Gray in growing the business of OAD. Instead, Walstrom began to transition OAD's clients to his own accounts and eventually ceased all activities on OAD's behalf.
- 14. As part of his scheme to usurp OAD's business opportunities for his own benefit, Walstrom purportedly resigned from Sydney and transferred his interest in OAD to Sydney, which is now owned by Bruening or other family members. Walstrom did not advise OAD of these events until November 12, 2004, by which time he was actively engaged in the process of competing with OAD for the clients that he previously handled on behalf of the close corporation.
- 15. As part of his competitive efforts, Walstrom has contacted OAD's clients and advised them, among other things, that (a) OAD is experiencing financial troubles and is not expected to survive, and (b) Walstrom's new program is superior to the products and services that he previously distributed on behalf of OAD.
- 16. By email dated November 3, 2004, OAD provided Sydney and Walstrom with an immediate declaration of termination of the distributor agreement pursuant to §§

12.02(c) and 12.02(e) thereof. In addition, OAD advised Sydney and Walstrom of their obligations under § 12.03(a) of the agreement to return all OAD and JAQ materials to OAD immediately, as well as their obligation under § 13.02 to refrain from directly or indirectly soliciting OAD's clients during the 12-month period following termination.

COUNT ONE Declaratory Judgment

- 17. OAD repeats and incorporates by reference each of the allegations set forth above as if fully stated herein.
- 18. An actual controversy exists between OAD and Sydney with respect to Sydney's performance under the Distributor Agreement. Specifically, OAD contends that Sydney breached the following provisions:
 - § 8.01 nonpayment of annual royalties and OAD's portion of Distributor billings.
 - § 8.04 nonpayment of material purchases.
 - § 9.01(b) Selling product(s) competitive with the OAD Program.
 - § 9.01(d) Using materials in connection with the OAD Program without the express permission of OAD.
 - § 9.01(f) Failing to execute or supply OAD with standard client agreement and seminar agreement forms.
 - § 9.01(g) Training people in the OAD Management Seminar who are not bona fide employees; and failing to provide OAD with fully executed copies of seminar agreement forms.

- § 10.01 Failing to provide OAD with accurate and complete records.
- 19. An actual controversy also exists with respect to § 13.02 of the Distributor Agreement, which provides as follows:

Upon termination of this Agreement for any reason, [Sydney] covenants and agrees that it will not solicit, directly or indirectly, any party who was a client of OAD LLC at any time during the Twelve (12) months preceding the date of termination for the purpose of selling to such person a personnel assessment or evaluation Program similar to or competitive with the OAD Program. A covenant similar to the foregoing covenant in favor of OAD LLC shall be executed and delivered to OAD LLC by each and every director, officer, and employee of [Sydney].

20. Walstrom and Sydney have failed to acknowledge their defaults under the applicable agreements, to return all OAD and JAQ materials, and to refrain from soliciting OAD's clients. Accordingly, OAD is entitled to a declaration of its rights, as well as the obligations of Sydney, Walstrom and Bruening, with respect to the termination of the distributor agreement.

COUNT TWO Breach of Contract

- 21. OAD repeats and incorporates by reference each of the allegations set forth above as if fully stated herein.
- 22. Sydney and Walstrom Group have breached their obligations to OAD under the above agreements.

- 23. OAD has suffered damages as a result of the breaches of Sydney and Walstrom Group.
- 24. OAD is entitled to recover damages against Sydney and Walstrom Group, plus interest, costs and attorneys' fees.

COUNT THREE Breach of Fiduciary Duty

- 25. OAD repeats and incorporates by reference each of the allegations set forth above as if fully stated herein.
- 26. OAD is a close corporation, with only two equity members Walstrom (23%) and Michael Gray (77%).
- 27. As a member and manager of OAD, Walstrom owes a fiduciary duty of the utmost good faith and loyalty to the corporation.
- by, among other things: (a) soliciting OAD's clients for his own benefit; (b) usurping corporate opportunities; (c) falsely representing to OAD's clients that OAD's program is inferior to products and services offered by competitors; (d) playing corporate shell games; (e) withholding monies owed to OAD; (f) refusing to permit OAD to audit his books and records; and (g) otherwise acting in a manner designed to damage the economic interests of OAD.

29. OAD has suffered damages as a direct result of Walstrom's breaches of fiduciary duty.

COUNT FIVE Promissory Estoppel

- 30. OAD repeats and incorporates by reference each of the allegations set forth above as if fully stated herein.
- 31. Walstrom and Bruening promised not to solicit, directly or indirectly, any person or entity who was a client of OAD during the 12-month period following the termination the Distributor Agreement, as evidenced by Section 13.02 thereof.
- 32. In making such promises, Walstrom and Bruening, reasonably should have expected to induce OAD to enter into the Distributor Agreement and provide them with OAD's trade secrets and confidential information.
- 33. Injustice can be avoided only by enforcing the non-solicitation agreements of Walstrom and Bruening.

COUNT SIX Defamation

- 34. OAD repeats and incorporates by reference each of the allegations set forth above as if fully stated herein.
- 35. On information and belief, Walstrom has been advising OAD's clients that OAD is bankrupt, that OAD is about to go out of business, and that OAD's program is

inferior to the products and services currently offered by Walstrom.

- 36. Walstrom's malicious publication of these false statements has injured OAD's reputation in general and caused particular clients to refrain from purchasing OAD's goods and services.
- 37. OAD has suffered damages as a direct result of Walstrom's defamatory statements.

COUNT SEVEN Injunctive Relief

- 38. OAD repeats and incorporates by reference each of the allegations set forth above as if fully stated herein.
- 39. Pursuant to the distributor agreement, Sydney and its principals (i.e., Walstrom and Bruening) expressly acknowledged and agreed that (a) the OAD Program and related materials constitute confidential trade secrets of OAD, which must be maintained in the strictest confidence, (b) all OAD Program software disks and related materials must be returned to OAD immediately upon termination of the agreement in order to protect the confidentiality of OAD's trade secrets, and (c) neither Sydney nor any of its officers, directors, and employees shall directly or indirectly solicit any party who was a client of OAD at any time during the 12 months preceding the date of termination

to purchase a similar or competing personnel assessment or evaluation program.

- 40. On information and belief, Sydney, Walstrom and Bruening have violated their confidentiality and non-solicitation agreements.
- 41. OAD has been or will be irreparably harmed by the defendants' misconduct as the protection of its trade secrets and client base is critically important to the viability of its business.
- 42. OAD has a high likelihood of success on the merits of its non-solicitation claims against Sydney, Walstrom and Bruening. Thus, OAD is entitled to an injunction which, among other things, requires the defendants (a) to immediately return the relevant materials to OAD, (b) to refrain from soliciting OAD's clients, (c) to provide OAD with a full and complete accounting of its activities.

WHEREFORE, OAD respectfully requests the entry of judgment against the defendants for (a) all damages suffered as a result of their misconduct, including interest, costs and attorneys' fees, (b) the injunctive relief set forth above, and (c) such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

OAD REQUESTS A TRIAL BY JURY ON ALL ISSUES SO TRIABLE

OAD LLC,

By its attorneys,

CRAIG AND MACAULEY PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

Markin P. Desmery (BBO 550133)

Craig and Macauley

Professional Corporation Federal Reserve Plaza 600 Atlantic Avenue

Boston, Massachusetts 02210

(617) 367-9500

Case 1:05-cv-10150-RCL Document 1 Filed 01/26/2005 Page 18 of 20 Commonwealth of Massachusetts County of Plymouth The Superior Court

CIVIL DOCKET# PLCV2004-01381-B

OAD LLC

VS.

Sydney, Inc., Walstrom Group, Inc., Gary W. Walstrom, Cecelia Bruening

ORDER OF NOTICE

To the above-named Defendants:

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED that Motion has been made in said action, as appears in the motion of the Plaintiff, for a preliminary injunction and that a hearing upon such motion will be held at the court house at said Plymouth, on 01/31/2005 A.D. at 02:00 PM in CtRm 1 (Court Street, Plymouth) (Plymouth), at which time you may appear and show cause why such Motion should not be granted.

Witness, Barbara J. Rouse, Esquire, Chief Justice of the Superior Court, at Plymouth, Massachusetts this 21st day of January. 2005.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

PLYMOUTH, ss.

SUPERIOR COURT C.A. No. 04-1381B

OAD LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

SYDNEY, INC., d/b/a
OAD MIDWEST, WALSTROM GROUP,
INC., GARY W. WALSTROM,
CECELIA BREUNING,

Defendants.

COPY

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

Plaintiff OAD LLC ("OAD") hereby moves, pursuant to Mass. R. Civ. P. 65(b), for entry of the following preliminary injunction against defendants Sydney, Inc., d/b/a OAD Midwest, The Walstrom Group, Inc., Gary W. Walstrom, and Cecelia Bruening:

- A. That defendants Gary W. Walstrom, Cecelia Bruening, The Walstrom Group, Inc., and Sydney, Inc., d/b/a OAD Midwest, their respective officers, directors, agents, servants, employees, pledgees, assignees, nominees, trustees, attorneys, subsidiaries and affiliates, and all persons in active concert or participation with them who receive actual notice of the Order shall:
 - 1. immediately return to OAD LLC any and all unused OAD Program software disks and other materials in their possession, including all OAD Organization Surveys, JAQ Questionnaires, training materials, and all other written materials pertaining to or relating to the OAD Program, whether or not provided by OAD LLC;

- 2. provide OAD LLC and/or its accountants immediate access to the books and records of both The Walstrom Group, Inc. and Sydney, Inc., d/b/a OAD Midwest; and
- 3. Until November 3, 2005, refrain from soliciting, directly or indirectly, any party who was a client of OAD LLC at any time during the twelve (12) months preceding November 3, 2004 for the purpose of selling to such person or entity a personnel assessment or evaluation Program similar to or competitive with the OAD Program.
- 4. Until November 3, 2005, refrain from using or logging on to the OAD Website for the purpose of training, supporting or otherwise assisting any party who was a client of OAD LLC at any time during the twelve (12) months preceding November 3, 2004.

In support of its request for injunctive relief, OAD directs the Court's attention to the Affidavit of Michael Gray and its supporting memorandum of law, both of which are filed contemporaneously herewith.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated and upon the authorities cited in its accompanying memorandum of law, plaintiff OAD LLC respectfully requests that the Court enter the above-stated preliminary injunction.

OAD LLC,

By its attorneys,

CRAIG AND MACAULEY
PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

Dated: January 20, 2005

Martin P. Desmery (BBO# 550133) Daniel C. Reiser (EBO# 638204)

Craig and Macauley

Professional Corporation Federal Reserve Plaza 600 Atlantic Avenue Boston, Massachusetts 02210 (617) 367-9500

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein nether relations or supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference while the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE RELEGIOUS OF THE FORM.)

(OBB II	TOTAL CONTROL THE REP	proposition receive.)				
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS	······································	
OAD LLC	17	005 JAN 26 P	2: 1	SYDNEY, INC.,	d/b/a OAD MIDWEST WALSTROM, and CE	Γ, WALSTROM GROUP, CCELIA BRUENING
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF	PlymouthroleT	couRi	County of Residence	of First Listed Defendant	out-of-state
(E	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF ξ	DISTRICT OF I	MASS	,	(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES	ONLY)
		BIZIKICI DI		1	ID CONDEMNATION CASES, L INVOLVED.	USE THE LOCATION OF THE
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name	, Address, and Telephone Numb	per)		Attorneys (If Known)		
CRAIG AND MACAUL				,	ORCESTER LLP, One I	Dogt Office Course
Avenue, Boston, MA 022	210, 617-367-9500 (s	ee attachment)		Boston, MA 02109), 617-338-2800 (see at	rosi Office Square,
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X"	in One Box Only)	III. CI			(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
13.1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Governmen	nt Not a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only) P	TF DEF 1 1 Incorporated or P of Business In Th	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF rincipal Place
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	■ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizens	thip of Partics in Item III)	Citizo	en of Another State	1 2	Principal Place 🗇 5 🗷 5
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT						
☐ 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJUR		FEITURE/PENALTY 10 Agriculture	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
☐ 120 Marine	☐ 310 Airplane	362 Personal Injury	- 5 6	10 Agriculture 20 Other Food & Drug	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal	☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust
☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability	Med. Malpractice 365 Personal Injury	. □ 6:	25 Drug Related Seizure	28 USC 157	430 Banks and Banking
□ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	Product Liability	□ 6	of Property 21 USC 881 30 Liquor Laws	PROPERTY RIGHTS	☐ 450 Commerce☐ 460 Deportation
& Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act	Slander 330 Federal Employers'	☐ 368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product		40 R.R. & Truck 50 Airline Regs.	☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 830 Patent	470 Racketeer Influenced and
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	Liability	Liability	□ 60	60 Occupational	3840 Trademark	Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit
(Excl. Veterans)	☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product	PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud		Safety/Health 90 Other		☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV ☐ 810 Selective Service
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability 350 Motor Vehicle	371 Truth in Lending		LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	850 Securities/Commodities/
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle	☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage		10 Fair Labor Standards Act	☐ 861 HIA (1395ff) ☐ 862 Black Lung (923)	Exchange 875 Customer Challenge
190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability 360 Other Personal	 385 Property Damage Product Liability 		20 Labor/Mgmt. Relations	☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	12 USC 3410
196 Franchise	Injury			30 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting & Disclosure Act	☐ 864 SSID Title XVI ☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation	CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting	PRISONER PETITION 3 510 Motions to Vacat	NS 7 74	40 Railway Labor Act 90 Other Labor Litigation	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	☐ 892 Economic Stabilization Act
☐ 220 Forcelosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 442 Employment	Sentence	D 79	91 Empl. Ret. Inc.	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)	☐ 893 Environmental Matters ☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act
☐ 240 Torts to Land	☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations	Habeas Corpus: 530 General		Security Act	☐ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	895 Freedom of Information
 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property 	☐ 444 Welfare ☐ 445 Amer, w/Disabilities -	535 Death Penalty			20 GSC 7009	Act 900Appeal of Fee Determination
= 2707111 Outer Real Property	Employment	☐ 550 Civil Rights	ner			Under Equal Access to Justice
:	446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other	☐ 555 Prison Condition				950 Constitutionality of
	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights	<u> </u>	-			State Statutes
🗇 l Original 🗵 2 Ro	an "X" in One Box Only) emoved from	Remanded from		tated or 🗀 🥇 anothe	erred from	Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate
	Cite the U.S. Civil St		Reope e filing (I	ened (specif Do not cite jurisdictions	V) Litigation Il statutes unless diversity):	Judgment
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO						
	Contract dispute	ause. among citizens of c	lifferent	states		·
VII. REQUESTED IN	☐ CHECK IF THIS	IS A CLASS ACTION	DE	MAND S	CHECK YES only	if demanded in complaint:
COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P.	. 23	Se	e attachment	JURY DEMAND:	☑ Yes ☐ No
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY Q	RECORD	- 	
January J	6.2005		100	1 ////	-6	
OR OFFICE USE ONLY			C		The C	
RECEIPT #AM	10UNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. JUD	GE

CIVIL COVER SHEET ATTACHMENT

I. (c) For the Defendants: SULLIVAN & WORCESTER LLP

One Post Office Square Boston, MA 02109 (617)-338-2800

by Ira K. Gross and Nicholas M. O'Donnell

For the Plaintiff: CRAIG AND MACAULEY P.C.

Federal Reserve Plaza 600 Atlantic Avenue Boston, MA 02210 (617) 367-9500

by Martin P. Desmery and Daniel C. Reiser

VII. Demand: Plaintiff demands injunctive relief and damages, although nowhere in the Complaint is any amount of requested damages specified. The state court civil cover sheet references "declaratory relief" and damages "over \$50,000." As noted in the accompanying Notice of Removal, defendants believe that the combined relief requested would exceed \$75,000.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

1. Title of case (name of first party on each aide only) OAD LLC V. Sydney, Inc., d/b/s OAD Midwest S OFFICE 2. Category in which the case bislongs based upon the numbered nature of sull code listed or the civil cover hand Post 1.1 I.					DISTRICT OF MASSACHI	USETTS	i	N CLEDE	ED.
2. Category in which the case belongs based upon the numbered nature of sult code listed on the civic cover sheel Rosp. 1!	1.	Title of ca	ise (nan	ne of first party on each side	only)_OAD LLC v. Sydi	ney, Inc.			SOFFICE
incal rule 40.(a)(1)). I. 160, 410, 470, R.23, REGARDLESS OF NATURE OF SUIT. DISTRICT COURT	2	Category	in whic	h the case belongs based up	on the much and add			105 JAN 25	
*Also complete AO 120 or AO 121 Total Page 179, 79, 191, 287, 280, 380, 586, 585, 829, 710, 720, 730, *Also complete AO 120 or AO 121 for patent, trademark or copyright cases III.			local rule 40 1/2/41)						
*Also complete AO 120 or AO 121 Total Page 179, 79, 191, 287, 280, 380, 586, 585, 829, 710, 720, 730, *Also complete AO 120 or AO 121 for patent, trademark or copyright cases III.		ſ		•	RDLESS OF NATURE OF SI	шт	DIS	DISTRICT TRICT OF	COURT
*Also complete AO 120 or AO 121 Total Page 179, 79, 191, 287, 280, 380, 586, 585, 829, 710, 720, 730, *Also complete AO 120 or AO 121 for patent, trademark or copyright cases III.								or UF	MASS!
110, 120, 130, 130, 131, 130, 210, 230, 240, 245, 280, 310, 315, 320, 330, 345, 345, 330, 355, 360, 362, 365, 360, 362, 365, 360, 362, 365, 360, 362, 365, 360, 362, 365, 360, 362, 365, 360, 360, 360, 360, 360, 360, 360, 360		şy	11-	740, 790, 791, 820*, 830*,	840*, 850, 855, 625, 710, 840*, 850, 890, 892-894, 89	, 720, 730, 95, 950.			
V. 150, 152, 153. 3. Title and number, if any, of related cases. (See local rule 40.1(g)). If more than one prior related case has been filed in this district please indicate the title and number of the first filed case in this court. 4. Has a prior action between the same parties and based on the same claim ever been filed in this court? YES NO YES NO YES NO YES USC §22403) If so, is the U.S.A. or an officer, agent or employee of the U.S. a party? YES NO YES YES NO YES NO YES NO YES YES NO YES NO YES YES YES YES NO YES YES YES YES YES YES YES NO YES		American	III.	315, 320, 330, 340, 345, 3	90, 210, 230, 240, 245, 290 50, 355, 360, 362, 365, 370	, 310, , 371,			
3. Title and number, if any, of related cases. (See local rule 40.1(g)). If more than one prior related case has been filed in this district please indicate the title and number of the first filed case in this court. 4. Has a prior action between the same parties and based on the same claim ever been filed in this court? YES NO YES YES YES NO YES NO YES YES YES NO YES NO YES YES YES NO YES YES NO YES YES YES NO YES YES YES NO YES YES YES NO YES YES YES YES NO YES YES YES NO YES YES YES NO YES YES YES YES NO YES YES YES NO YES			IV.	220, 422, 423, 430, 460, 53 690, 810, 861-865, 870, 87	10, 530, 610, 620, 630, 640 1, 875, 900.	, 650, 660,			
4. Has a prior action between the same parties and based on the same claim ever been filed in this court? YES NO V Soes the complaint in this case question the constitutionality of an act of congress affecting the public interest? (See 28 USC §2403) YES NO V If so, is the U.S.A. or an officer, agent or employee of the U.S. a party? YES NO V A. Is this case required to be heard and determined by a district court of three judges pursuant to title 28 USC §2284? YES NO V 7. Do all of the parties in this action, excluding governmental agencies of the united states and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts ("governmental agencies"), residing in Massachusetts reside in the same division? - (See Local Rule 40.1(d)). A. If yes, in which division do all of the non-governmental parties reside? Eastern Division Central Division Western Division B. If no, in which division do the majority of the plaintiffs or the only parties, excluding governmental agencies, residing in Massachusetts reside? Eastern Division Central Division Western Division 8. If filling a Notice of Removal - are there any motions pending in the state court requiring the attention of this Court? (If yes, submit a separate sheet identifying the motions) YES NO NO PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT) ATTORNEY'S NAME ITA K. Gross and Nicholas M. O'Donnell ADDRESS SULLIVAN & WORCESTER LLP, One Post Office Square, Boston, MA 02109			٧.	150, 152, 153.					
5. Does the complaint in this case question the constitutionality of an act of congress affecting the public Interest? (See 28 USC §2403) YES NO V On this case required to be heard and determined by a district court of three judges pursuant to title 28 USC §2284? YES NO V 7. Do all of the parties in this action, excluding governmental agencies of the united states and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts ("governmental agencies"), residing in Massachusetts reside in the same division? - (See Local Rule 40.1(d)). A. If yes, in which division do all of the non-governmental parties reside? Eastern Division Central Division Western Division B. If no, in which division do the majority of the plaintiffs or the only parties, excluding governmental agencies, residing in Massachusetts reside? Eastern Division Central Division Western Division 8. If filling a Notice of Removal - are there any motions pending in the state court requiring the attention of this Court? (if yes, submit a separate sheet identifying the motions) YES NO PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT) ATTORNEY'S NAME Ira K. Gross and Nicholas M. O'Donnell ADDRESS SULLIVAN & WORCESTER LLP, One Post Office Square, Boston, MA 02109	3.	Title and r	iumber, it pleas	if any, of related cases. (See e indicate the title and numbe	e local rule 40.1(g)). If more of the first filed case in the	e than one nis court.	prior related	case has been	filed in
Does the complaint in this case question the constitutionality of an act of congress affecting the public interest? (See 28 USC §2403) YES NO If so, is the U.S.A. or an officer, agent or employee of the U.S. a party? YES NO Is this case required to be heard and determined by a district court of three judges pursuant to title 28 USC §2284? YES NO 7. Do all of the parties in this action, excluding governmental agencies of the united states and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts ("governmental agencies"), residing in Massachusetts reside in the same division? - (See Local Rule 40.1(d)). A. If yes, in which division do all of the non-governmental parties reside? Eastern Division Central Division Western Division B. If no, in which division do the majority of the plaintiffs or the only parties, excluding governmental agencies, residing in Massachusetts reside? Eastern Division Central Division Western Division 8. If filling a Notice of Removal - are there any motions pending in the state court requiring the attention of this Court? (If yes, submit a separate sheet identifying the motions) YES NO NO ATTORNEY'S NAME Ira K. Gross and Nicholas M. O'Donnell ADDRESS SULLIVAN & WORCESTER LLP, One Post Office Square, Boston, MA 02109	4.	Has a prio	r action	between the same parties a	nd based on the same clair	m ever bee	n filed in this	court?	
If so, is the U.S.A. or an officer, agent or employee of the U.S. a party? YES NO	5.	Does the c	omplaji	nt in this case question the co	netitutionality of an out of	YES	L N	0 🗸	
Fiso, is the U.S.A. or an officer, agent or employee of the U.S. a party? YES NO		28 USC §2	403)	and vada quasiion the co	prisulationality of an act of	congress	affecting the p	oublic interest?	(See
6. Is this case required to be heard and determined by a district court of three judges pursuant to title 28 USC §2284? YES NO 7. Do all of the parties in this action, excluding governmental agencies of the united states and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts ("governmental agencies"), residing in Massachusetts reside in the same division? - (See Local Rule 40.1(d)). A. If yes, in which division do all of the non-governmental parties reside? Eastern Division Central Division Western Division B. If no, in which division do the majority of the plaintiffs or the only parties, excluding governmental agencies, residing in Massachusetts reside? Eastern Division Central Division Western Division 8. If filling a Notice of Removal - are there any motions pending in the state court requiring the attention of this Court? (If yes, submit a separate sheet identifying the motions) YES NO [PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT] ATTORNEY'S NAME ITA K. Gross and Nicholas M. O'Donnell ADDRESS SULLIVAN & WORCESTER LLP, One Post Office Square, Boston, MA 02109		If so, is the	U.S.A.	or an officer, agent or emplo	yee of the U.S. a party?	YES	L. NO		
7. Do all of the parties in this action, excluding governmental agencies of the united states and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts ("governmental agencies"), residing in Massachusetts reside in the same division? - (See Local Rule 40.1(d)). A. If yes, in which division do all of the non-governmental parties reside? Eastern Division B. If no, in which division do the majority of the plaintiffs or the only parties, excluding governmental agencies, residing in Massachusetts reside? Eastern Division Central Division Western Division 8. If filling a Notice of Removal - are there any motions pending in the state court requiring the attention of this Court? (If yes, submit a separate sheet identifying the motions) (PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT) ATTORNEY'S NAME Ira K. Gross and Nicholas M. O'Donnell ADDRESS SULLIVAN & WORCESTER LLP, One Post Office Square, Boston, MA 02109						YES	□ NO	o 🗍	
7. Do all of the parties in this action, excluding governmental agencies of the united states and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts ("governmental agencies"), residing in Massachusetts reside in the same division? - (See Local Rule 40.1(d)). A. If yes, in which division do all of the non-governmental parties reside? Eastern Division Central Division Western Division B. If no, in which division do the majority of the plaintiffs or the only parties, excluding governmental agencies, residing in Massachusetts reside? Eastern Division Central Division Western Division 8. If filling a Notice of Removal - are there any motions pending in the state court requiring the attention of this Court? (If yes, submit a separate sheet identifying the motions) (PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT) ATTORNEY'S NAME Ira K. Gross and Nicholas M. O'Donnell ADDRESS SULLIVAN & WORCESTER LLP, One Post Office Square, Boston, MA 02109	6.	is this case	requir	ed to be heard and determine	d by a district court of thre	e judges p	oursuant to tit	tle 28 USC 8228	42
A. If yes, in which division do all of the non-governmental parties reside? Eastern Division B. If no, in which division do the majority of the plaintiffs or the only parties, excluding governmental agencies, residing in Massachusetts reside? Eastern Division Central Division Western Division Western Division Western Division Western Division If filling a Notice of Removal - are there any motions pending in the state court requiring the attention of this Court? (If yes, submit a separate sheet identifying the motions) (PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT) ATTORNEY'S NAME Ira K. Gross and Nicholas M. O'Donnell ADDRESS SULLIVAN & WORCESTER LLP, One Post Office Square, Boston, MA 02109							1		~ .
A. If yes, in which division do all of the non-governmental parties reside? Eastern Division B. If no, in which division do the majority of the plaintiffs or the only parties, excluding governmental agencies, residing in Massachusetts reside? Eastern Division Central Division Western Division 8. If filling a Notice of Removal - are there any motions pending in the state court requiring the attention of this Court? (If yes, submit a separate sheet identifying the motions) (PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT) ATTORNEY'S NAME Ira K. Gross and Nicholas M. O'Donnell ADDRESS SULLIVAN & WORCESTER LLP, One Post Office Square, Boston, MA 02109	7.	massachus	e partie etts ("g	s in this action, excluding go jovernmental agencies"), res	overnmental agencies of th siding in Massachusetts re	e united st eside in the	tates and the	Commonwealth on? - (See Loc	of al Rule
Eastern Division B. If no, in which division do the majority of the plaintiffs or the only parties, excluding governmental agencies, residing in Massachusetts reside? Eastern Division Central Division Western Division 8. If filling a Notice of Removal - are there any motions pending in the state court requiring the attention of this Court? (If yes, submit a separate sheet identifying the motions) (PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT) ATTORNEY'S NAME Ira K. Gross and Nicholas M. O'Donnell SULLIVAN & WORCESTER LLP, One Post Office Square, Boston, MA 02109		А		If yes, in which division do_	all of the non-governments	YES	NO No		
agencies, residing in Massachusetts reside? Eastern Division Central Division Western Division 8. If filling a Notice of Removal - are there any motions pending in the state court requiring the attention of this Court? (If yes, submit a separate sheet identifying the motions) (PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT) ATTORNEY'S NAME Ira K. Gross and Nicholas M. O'Donnell ADDRESS SULLIVAN & WORCESTER LLP, One Post Office Square, Boston, MA 02109								rn Division	
Eastern Division Central Division Western Division If filling a Notice of Removal - are there any motions pending in the state court requiring the attention of this Court? (If yes, submit a separate sheet identifying the motions) (PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT) ATTORNEY'S NAME Ira K. Gross and Nicholas M. O'Donnell ADDRESS SULLIVAN & WORCESTER LLP, One Post Office Square, Boston, MA 02109		В		If no, in which division do the agencies, residing in Mass.	e majority of the plaintiffs	or the only	parties, excl	uding governm	ental
(PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT) ATTORNEY'S NAME Ira K. Gross and Nicholas M. O'Donnell ADDRESS SULLIVAN & WORCESTER LLP, One Post Office Square, Boston, MA 02109				***************************************			Wester	rn Division	
(PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT) ATTORNEY'S NAME Ira K. Gross and Nicholas M. O'Donnell ADDRESS SULLIVAN & WORCESTER LLP, One Post Office Square, Boston, MA 02109	8.	lf filing a No yes, submit	tice of I a separ	Removal - are there any motionate and the motion in the mo	ons pending in the state col	urt requirin	g the attentio	on of this Court	? (If
ATTORNEY'S NAME Ira K. Gross and Nicholas M. O'Donnell ADDRESS SULLIVAN & WORCESTER LLP, One Post Office Square, Boston, MA 02109	(PLEAS	SE TYPE OR E	RINT			YES	NO	0.00	
ADDRESS SULLIVAN & WORCESTER LLP, One Post Office Square, Boston, MA 02109				Gross and Nicholas M.	O'Donnell				
						Boston.	MA 02109	-	
									

Attachment to Civil Category Sheet

Plymouth Superior Court Docket Entry No. 4: Plaintiff OAD LLC Motion for Preliminary Injunction under Counts 1 through 4

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

CLERK'S NOTICE

This document can not be scanned due to its size, or the way in which it was bound.

The original is available for viewing in the Clerk's Office.